

CHRONOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL EVENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Supplement to

THE WORLD TODAY

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

Published twice a month by the Royal Institute of International
Affairs, Chatham House, St. James's Square, London, S.W.1

Annual subscription 12s. 6d. Per copy 6d.

Volume 11. No. 4 (<i>New Series</i>)	February 4—17, 1946
CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF EVENTS	89
THE UNITED NATIONS MEETING	105

ALBANIA. *Feb. 13.*—Greek statement regarding question of admission of Albania to the U.N. Assembly. (*see Greece.*)

Feb. 15.—The execution was announced of the two Regents Lecnizzi and Harnati and the ex-Premier, Bushati, for war crimes.

ARGENTINA. *Feb. 4.*—The Foreign Ministry sent a Note to the U.S. Embassy virtually repudiating Col. Peron's charges about smuggling arms and pointing out that the Government's opinions on foreign affairs were expressed exclusively by the Ministry. Col. Peron had resigned all Government posts. Smuggling was going on across the frontier from Uruguay, but the Government had no evidence of any kind implicating the U.S. Embassy or suggesting connivance.

Feb. 9.—Mass demonstrations organized by the Democratic Union took place in Buenos Ayres. The leader of the Progressive Democratic Party declared that a *Putsch* was being organized for Feb. 23 and 24.

Feb. 10.—Col. Peron was formally proclaimed the Labour candidate for the Presidency at a mass meeting in the capital, and made a speech attacking Mr. Braden, the former U.S. Ambassador. He accused him of interfering in their internal affairs, in violation of all diplomatic traditions.

Feb. 12.—Publication of American blue book regarding Argentine help for Germany. (*see U.S.A.*)

Feb. 14.—Col. Peron, interviewed by *La Epoca*, stated that Mr. Braden, when Ambassador, had been the head of a spy ring embracing all South America. All that the blue book said about him was inexact, and he challenged Mr. Braden to produce proofs.

AUSTRALIA. *Feb. 6.*—The Minister of Commerce announced that Australia would have to consume less wheat, to ease the world shortage, adding that he had received a telegram from the British Minister of Food which was alarming. He outlined plans for increased shipments of grain, meat, and fruit.

Feb. 7.—The Government decided that all wheat and flour that the railways could bring to the ports should be shipped oversea before July, and wheat held for stock feed would be diverted for export. Some 5 million bushels had already been secured in this way, and that was the maximum that the railways could at present guarantee to take to the ports, according to statements by the Minister of Commerce.

BELGIUM. *Feb. 17.*—Polling took place for the General Election.

BERMUDA. *Feb. 11.*—The Anglo-American civil aviation conference ended and an agreement was signed, the main points of which were: (1) Rates to be charged by aircraft operating between the two countries to be subject to Government review; (2) Each country to be free to determine the frequency of operations of its air lines; (3) Freedom to carry passengers and cargo between two foreign countries in accordance with defined principles subject to adjustment in particular cases where this might be found necessary in the light of experience; and (4) Agreement on an initial Schedule of world-wide air routes of mutual interest to both countries.

CANADA. *Feb. 9.*—The Government agreed to provide China with a credit of \$60 million for the purchase of Canadian goods in 1946 and 1947. Interest was 3 per cent and repayment would begin in 1948 in equal instalments of principal over 30 years.

Feb. 11.—The Minister of Reconstruction announced that the Government was setting up a body named "Canadian Arsenals, Ltd." comparable to a fourth service of the armed forces, to make possible the quick mobilization of the country's industrial capacity so as to enable it to "keep its covenant with U.N.O."

Feb. 12.—Sir Wilfred Eady, a British representative in the financial discussions in Ottawa (which began the previous day) told the press that Britain's seeking loans was concerned entirely with her external economic problem. Owing to the war half her merchant navy had been lost, oversea investments totalling \$4,500 million had been liquidated, and her net income from abroad had been reduced to \$400 million. By the time lend-lease and mutual aid had been devised Britain had spent \$6,000 million. She had built up her liquid reserves to \$1,750 million by September, 1945 but external liabilities than totalled \$14,500 million, which would be \$19,000 million if the U.S. loan was sanctioned.

It was announced that the Government had agreed to lend the Dutch Government \$100 million in addition to the \$25 million lent in May, 1945. It would be repaid in 27 annual instalments beginning in 1950. The average interest would be 3.05 per cent.

Feb. 16.—Twelve persons were arrested near Ottawa charged with the disclosure of official secrets to agents of a foreign Power. Unofficial reports stated that the counter-espionage authorities had found that Russia had been building up a large intelligence service in Canada.

CHINA. Under Jan. 31 (in Supplement No. 3) in the 4th line the sentence reading "60 per cent of whom were Communists" should have read "60 per cent of whom were Kuomintang members".

Feb. 5.—Gen. Chiang Kai-shek told the press that his personal responsibility to the people would be ended when the new coalition Government was established. The agreement reached for that was just the beginning of co-operation and unity among the political parties. Sovereignty would be restored to the people by the Kuomintang, and after constitutional government had been established the responsibility of the Kuomintang would remain, but would be shared with others.

Feb. 9.—Credit granted to China by Canada. (see *Canada*.)

Feb. 11.—White Paper published regarding Russia's entry into the war and China's agreement to the terms. (see *Great Britain*.)

Feb. 15.—Press reports current in Chungking stated that the Soviet Union was demanding complete economic cooperation with China in Manchuria, including the control by Russia of communications, the establishment of a safety corridor to Port Arthur, and the right of Russians to buy land in Manchuria.

It was stated in Chungking that the U.S. Government had asked China for full particulars of the reports that Russia was stripping all Manchurian industry without consulting the Allies.

Feb. 16.—The U.S. C-in-C. in China stated in Chungking that the Chinese 6th Army was being transported to Manchuria in reply to the Chinese Government's request that additional forces be sent there.

Feb. 17.—The Government news agency in Yenan put forward a claim for joint control of Manchuria with Chungking. It stated that civil war was going on there between Communist and Chungking troops, particularly at Taian, Panshan, and Yingkow, and opinion in Chungking was reported to be that the Communist were agreeable to military peace and a political coalition in China proper, but were ready to fight to enforce their political demands in Manchuria.

EGYPT. Feb. 4.—The Prime Minister announced in the Senate that Egypt insisted on having a place at the peace conference.

Feb. 9.—Students in Cairo and Alexandria attempting to stage anti-British demonstrations were stopped by the police when trying to march into the city. In Cairo they entered the university and passed resolutions on the political situation regarding the revision of the treaty.

Feb. 10.—Further demonstrations led to a student being accidentally killed by a police car in Cairo when large crowds tried to break through a cordon into the centre of the city. They barricaded themselves in the university and declared they would not resume their studies till the Prime Minister had resigned.

In Alexandria the students were joined by workers, and the police had to fire, wounding some 50 people.

Feb. 12.—Serious rioting occurred in Alexandria, and 3 people were killed. Students had gathered in the university grounds and heard violent speeches against the Government and Great Britain and then

tried to march to the industrial quarter. The police tried to turn them back, and were forced to fire.

Feb. 13.—Tue Ministers of Finance, War, and Supplies resigned again, Makram Ebeid Pasha giving as his reason the way in which the police were handling the students in the riots.

Feb. 15.—Nokrashy Pasha resigned the Premiership, and the King asked Ismail Sidky Pasha to form a Government.

Students' demonstrations again occurred in Cairo.

The British Ambassador left for London.

Feb. 16.—Some 2,000 students denounced Great Britain in a demonstration held outside the Royal palace in Cairo.

Feb. 17.—Sidky Pasha formed a Cabinet, with Lufty-es-Sayed Pasha as Foreign Minister; Saba Hubashy Bey, Commerce and Industry; Kamel Mursy Pasha, Justice; Hussein Enan Pasha, Agriculture; Abdel Kawy Pasha, Public Works; Abdel Samra Pasha, Social Affairs; Dessuky Abaza Pasha, Wakfs; and Hefny Mahmud Pasha, Communications. The Premier took the portfolios of Finance and the Interior. Five Ministers were Liberals and the rest Independents.

FRANCE. *Feb. 6.*—The Cabinet authorized the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of France Overseas to "conclude with Britain, as the Power directly interested, agreements for establishing in the Cameroons and Togoland the régime provided for in the San Francisco Charter".

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Assembly decided to send a small all-party mission to Greece to report on the Elections.

Feb. 7.—The Finance Minister told the Finance Committee of the Assembly that he had to reckon with a deficit of 310 milliard francs in 1946 and aimed at reducing this by half by increased taxation, the suppression of subsidies, and cuts in civil and military expenditure. (At 480 francs to the pound 310 milliard=over £645 million.)

Feb. 8.—Señor Giral, head of the Spanish "Government in Exile" arrived in Paris from America.

Feb. 9.—Trade agreement signed in Rome. (*see Italy.*)

Feb. 12.—M. Philip's Bill to deal with the financial crisis was defeated in the National Assembly by 497 votes to 73. The Army Minister announced that the armed forces were soon to be reduced to 580,000 men, of whom the Army would take 460,000, and the Navy 55,000.

Feb. 14.—The Assembly, by 434 votes to 92, approved M. Philip's tax proposals, which were part of his general plan for economic retrenchment. It began the debate on the second part—economies in the Civil Service.

Feb. 16.—The second part was adopted with very little opposition, after the Premier had stated that the war cost France in destruction and by the removal of plant and personal goods some 4,897,000 million francs (over £10,000 million).

GERMANY. *Feb. 4.*—The bodies of some 190,000 prisoners of war were found near Landsdorf, Silesia, according to a Moscow broadcast, and medical evidence showed that they had either been shot or had died of starvation, disease, or torture.

Feb. 11.—A camp in Munich for displaced persons was raided by U.S. Army police and many documents seized. Inmates of the camp were mostly members of the Yugoslav army captured by the Germans when they overran the country, and many held cards showing them to be followers of Col. Popovitch, who had been "attempting to organize an army in support of King Peter".

Feb. 12.—Gen. Schoengarth, a former S.S. Commander, and 4 of his staff were condemned to death for the murder in Holland of an R.A.F. prisoner of war in November, 1944.

Feb. 15.—The Anglo-American committee of inquiry into the position of Jewry completed its investigations in Germany and left for Austria.

GREAT BRITAIN. *Feb. 5.*—Recognition of the Rumanian Government. (*see Rumania.*)

Feb. 6.—The Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, in a report reviewing the food situation, stated that the broad picture emerging after taking into account all home-grown and imported food supplies available or in sight early in January was that over 140 million people in the countries reviewed would have to continue to live on a diet which provided an average of less than 2,000 calories a day. Of these, 100 million would probably be getting an average total of 1,500 calories or less.

The Colonial Secretary stated in Parliament that the Rajah of Sarawak had intimated that the territory should be ceded to the King and that the British Government had intimated that such a proposal would be acceptable to them.

Feb. 11.—M. Leon Blum arrived in London. A White Paper (Cmd. 6735) was published giving the terms of the secret agreement made at Yalta on Feb. 11, 1945 concerning the Soviet Union's entry into the war against Japan. It stated that "the leaders of the three Great Powers have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that: (1) the *status quo* in Outer Mongolia shall be preserved; (2) the former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, i.e. (a) the southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it shall be returned to the Soviet Union; (b) the commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the pre-eminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U.S.S.R. restored; (c) the Chinese Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad which provides an outlet to Dairen shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the pre-eminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria; (3) the Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union".

It was understood that Articles 1 and 2 would require the concurrence of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek.

The Soviet Union, for its part, expressed its readiness to conclude with China a pact of friendship and alliance in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.

Feb. 12.—King Zog, ex-King of Albania, left England for Egypt.

Statement regarding Britain's lost resources abroad. (*see Canada.*)

Feb. 13.—A White Paper was published (Cmd. 6737) giving documents and statistics of the world grain position, including statements by the British Ministers of Food and Agriculture and by President Truman. The figures showed that the production of wheat in Europe had dropped from 42 million tons, the average for 1934-38, to 23 million tons in 1945. Figures of stocks in the exporting countries and of shipments for relief in 1945 were also given.

Feb. 14.—Mr. Bevin stated in Parliament that no British troops had recently been sent to Teheran, and orders had been issued for all those in Persia to be withdrawn by March 2.

Feb. 15.—The full terms were published of the air transport agreement concluded in Bermuda.

Feb. 17.—It was stated in London that there was no general movement northward of Polish troops in Italy; the Poles were stationed along the Adriatic coast from Bari up to the plain of the Po.

GREECE. *Feb. 4.*—E.A.M. issued a statement accusing the police of obstructionism and dilatoriness in the registration in the electoral rolls of E.A.M. followers. (Identity papers and certificates of residence had to be obtained from the police.)

A course for generals was opened, organized by the British military mission.

Feb. 7.—E.A.M. central committee announced that they would not take part in "the electoral fiasco" unless a representative Government with extensive E.A.M. participation was formed, terrorism abolished, a political amnesty granted, revision of the electoral lists guaranteed, and the army and police purged. It also declared that the economic agreement with Britain was "enslaving the country to colonial exploitation".

Feb. 8.—The Prime Minister, referring to the Security Council's debate on Greece, said Greece was the true gainer, for she emerged from it with added stature. His Cabinet's position was strengthened, and it would do its utmost to establish the "democratic stability" of which Mr. Bevin spoke. In its determination to restore order it would deal with the Communists causing trouble in Macedonia as well as with X, which had caused disorder in the Peloponnese.

Feb. 13.—The Foreign Minister sent a letter to the President of the Security Council asking that Greece should be allowed, under Article 31 of the Charter, to take part in the discussion regarding the admission of Albania to the United Nations. He pointed out that in 1940-41 Albania joined the Axis Powers by sending 15 battalions against Greece, and his Government felt that consideration of the matter should be postponed till the next session of the Assembly, in the

hope that normal relations would have been established between the two countries.

HUNGARY. *Feb. 4.*—M. Nagy, President of the Assembly and a leader of the Smallholders Party, was appointed Prime Minister.

INDIA. *Feb. 5.*—The Food Member told the Legislative Assembly that India's deficit in food grains for 1946 was 3 million tons, but the full extent of the calamity caused by the weather was not yet known. He was taking a delegation representing Bombay, Mysore, and Madras to Washington and London to ask for more imports, and he invited the parties in the Assembly to nominate one or two non-officials to it.

The deputy-leader of the Congress Party in the Assembly refused to co-operate, saying the responsibility for providing food was the Government's. The British had taken upon themselves the responsibility for defending India, and in the course of doing so had reduced her to this pass.

Feb. 7.—The Viceroy toured the areas in Madras threatened by famine owing to the drought and promised that the central Government would do everything possible to help.

Feb. 8.—On leaving for home the leader of the British Parliamentary delegation told the press that they were "all conscious of the fact that India has attained political manhood".

Feb. 9.—It was stated in New Delhi that official estimates of the food situation showed a probable deficit of 4,270,000 tons of grains, which would have to be imported in order to give the rationed population 12 oz. of food a day (1,200 calories.)

Feb. 11.—Student demonstrations in Calcutta led to clashes with the police, who had to fire 3 times. One person was killed and 30 injured. The students protested against the sentences passed on I.N.A. officers.

The Viceroy received Mr. Jinnah and sent his private secretary to Mr. Gandhi to inform him of the food situation. An official statement said Lord Wavell invited them to use their influence to assist him in meeting the emergency.

The Muslim League decided to send two members to London and Washington with the Government's food delegation.

Feb. 12.—Mr. Gandhi was understood to have suggested that the Executive Council should be replaced by a responsible one chosen from the elected Members of the Central Legislature as the first step to dealing with the food crisis.

Rioting in Calcutta became so serious that the Governor had to call in the army. He said in a broadcast that the situation had degenerated into an attempt at mob rule, with the burning of transport, even that carrying food. Muslim leaders, addressing a crowd in the centre of the city, advised self-control, but said the police were responsible. A procession marched through the European area shouting "Jai Hind", the slogan of the I.N.A. Casualties so far were estimated at 14 killed and about 170 injured, including 20 police.

Feb. 13.—Rioting continued in Calcutta, and troops were forced to fire and use tear gas on the mob. Casualties to date were 32 killed and some 300 injured. The Bengal Government prohibited public meetings and processions. In the jute factory district outside Calcutta trains were held up and burned, stations set on fire, and some persons killed.

A convoy of 75 lorries bringing U.S. troops to the city on their way home was attacked and 37 officers and men injured.

Feb. 14.—The police were again compelled to fire in Calcutta to disperse crowds of millworkers, and 1 person was killed.

Feb. 15.—Disturbances at Meerut led to clashes with the police, who had to fire on a Muslim procession. Official figures of the casualties in Calcutta up to midnight on Feb. 14 were given (in Parliament in London), as 38 killed and 527 injured. Of the police 82 were injured.

Sir Frederick Burrows, the new Governor of Bengal, arrived in Calcutta.

Feb. 16.—The Viceroy announced in a broadcast that the daily cereal ration in British India was to be reduced from 16 to 12 oz, except for men doing heavy work. He fully appreciated that it was inadequate but it was all their resources would allow, and they must share out their food stores to save the people in the drought-stricken areas. Food must not be made a matter for party politics.

ITALY. *Feb. 4.*—The Foreign Minister handed to the Ambassadors of Britain, France, the U.S.A., and the U.S.S.R., a memorandum maintaining Italy's claim to the South Tyrol.

Feb. 8.—The Ministers of Reconstruction, Foreign Trade, and Transport resigned. (They represented the Action Body in the Coalition, and a serious split had occurred in the Party.)

Feb. 9.—A trade agreement with France was signed in Rome providing for the exchange of goods to a value of 7,000 million lire.

Feb. 16.—The Rome press announced that the "Uomo Qualunque" party led by Signor Giannini, and the Italian Democratic Party (Monarchist) had decided to form an alliance for the reconstruction of Italy.

Feb. 17.—The Consulta, by 174 votes to 151, decided to recommend that voting in the general election should be compulsory. It was disclosed that an Allied commission, investigating claims for compensation for help given to allied prisoners of war, had examined some 63,000 claims and disbursed 160 million lire, while each helper was to receive a certificate of thanks. (Over 50,000 prisoners were helped by Italians in various ways, and 12,000 succeeded in rejoining the allied forces).

JAPAN. *Feb. 5.*—The arrest was announced of 31 Germans suspected of organizing a disguised Nazi movement.

Feb. 11.—Gen. Homma was sentenced to death in Manila. He appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court for a civil trial, but this was rejected.

Feb. 17.—Ikeouchi, chiefly responsible for the inhuman treatment of Dutch and Australian prisoners in Ambon, was sentenced to death at Morotai.

JAVA. *Feb. 10.*—At a meeting between Dr. van Mook, Dr. Sjahrir, and Sir Archibald Clark Kerr the Lieut.-Governor handed to Dr. Sjahrir the statement of his Government's policy. (*see The Netherlands.*)

Feb. 11.—British and other journalists who visited an internment camp outside Soerakarta by arrangement with the nationalists found another camp in the town the existence of which had been denied by an official spokesman. It contained over 600 women and children living in terrible conditions and half-starved. When Dr. Sjahrir was asked about this, and the existence of other camps, he said the "Republicans" did not want the internees, whose presence was an embarrassment, but that certain nationalist elements wished to exchange them for several hundred Indonesians arrested by the British.

It was stated in Batavia that some 15,000 Dutch and Eurasians were still held in these camps, despite Dr. Sjahrir's promise more than 3 months earlier that the T.K.R. would escort them. So far only 165 women and children had reached Batavia.

Feb. 17.—Two Red Cross officials, who had just visited 50 camps for internees in the interior, reported that conditions were fairly good in spite of serious short-comings and that the Indonesians were genuinely trying to improve them. They saw 50 camps out of 100 believed to exist, and gave the total number of internees still in Javanese hands as 35,000.

MEXICO. *Feb. 7.*—An agreement was signed in Mexico City with the British Government providing for the appointment of experts to value certain petroleum industrial properties in order to decide on the compensation to be paid to British owners affected by acts of expropriation since March 17, 1938 by the Mexican Government. A parallel agreement was also signed with the Dutch Government.

THE NETHERLANDS. *Feb. 10.*—The Government plan for the constitutional future of Indonesia was published. It stated that the Government, inspired by the Queen's conviction expressed in her address on Dec. 6, 1942 took the view that the peoples of Indonesia should be enabled freely to decide their political destiny. They therefore considered it their duty to do everything in their power to create and fulfil the conditions which would permit such a free decision to be taken, and assure its international recognition, thereby complying with Article 73 of the Charter.

They were also convinced that the true interests of the peoples of Indonesia would find their best guarantee in the voluntary continuation of "one realm in which the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam, and Curaçao will participate, with complete self-reliance and freedom of conduct for each part regarding its internal affairs, but with readiness to render mutual assistance", to quote the Queen's words.

They therefore intended, in consultation with representatives of a large variety of groups in Indonesia, to draft a structure for the kingdom and for Indonesia based on a democratic partnership. This

structure would remain in force for a given period, during which it was believed that the conditions which would make possible the taking of a free decision would be fulfilled. After that period the partners would independently decide upon the continuance of their relations on the basis of a then complete and voluntary partnership. Difference of opinion as to whether that period should be further extended before a free decision could be taken would be submitted to a procedure of conciliation or, if necessary, of arbitration.

Discussions regarding the structure mentioned above would be held in accordance with the following points:

"(a) There shall be a Commonwealth of Indonesia, a partner in the kingdom, composed of territories possessing different degrees of autonomy.

"(b) There shall be established an Indonesian citizenship for all born in Indonesia; Netherlands and Indonesian citizens shall be entitled to exercise all civic rights in all parts of the kingdom.

"(c) The domestic affairs of the Commonwealth of Indonesia shall be managed independently by the Commonwealth's own institutions; for the Commonwealth as a whole the creation of a democratic representative body, containing therefore a substantial Indonesian majority, is contemplated, and furthermore a Cabinet, formed in political harmony with the representative body and a representative of the Crown as the head of the Government's executive.

"To be enabled to fulfil the obligations incumbent upon the kingdom as a result of Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations the representative of the Crown shall possess, under his responsibility to the Government of the kingdom, certain special powers to guarantee fundamental rights, efficient administration, and sound financial management. These powers shall be exercised only when these rights and interests are affected.

"The envisaged constitution shall comprise guarantees for fundamental rights, such as freedom of worship, legal equality without discrimination as to creed or race, protection of person and of property, the independence of the judiciary, protection of the rights of minorities, freedom of education, and freedom of opinion and expression.

"The central institutions functioning for the entire kingdom shall be composed of representatives of the constituent parts of the kingdom. The establishment of a Commonwealth Cabinet composed of ministers from the constituent parts of the kingdom is contemplated, as also Commonwealth legislation requiring the agreement of the parliaments of the respective constituent parts of the kingdom.

"After the entry into force of this constitution the Netherlands Government shall promote the early admission of the Commonwealth of Indonesia as a member of the United Nations."

PALESTINE. *Feb. 6.*—The Stern gang issued a declaration of war on the British authorities, to secure Jewish immigration and organize civil disobedience as well as armed attacks.

Jamal Husseini, former leader of the Palestine Arab Party, arrived in the country after 9 years' exile.

Feb. 7.—A British officer and an African soldier were killed at Agrobank military camp, near Jaffa, by armed Jews who looted the armoury. Three Jews were killed and others wounded.

PERSIA. *Feb. 4.*—The Prime Minister was understood to have received an intimation that the Soviet Government was ready to receive a Persian mission in Moscow. He received a message from Marshal Stalin thanking him for his friendly feelings and hoping that relations between the two nations would be increased and promote the welfare of both countries.

Feb. 11.—The orders forbidding political gathering were suspended.

Feb. 14.—The Prime Minister appointed a Cabinet, with M. Bayatt as Finance Minister; Gen. Ahmadi, War; M. Sepahbodi, Justice; M. Alahi, Agriculture; M. Daftari, Minister of State; Gen. Firouz, Communications; M. Sepehr, Industry and Commerce; M. Bahar, Education; and Dr. Iqbal, Health. The Premier took the portfolios of Foreign Affairs and the Interior.

Mr. Bevins statement about British troops in Teheran. (*see Great Britain*).

Feb. 17.—Gen. Arfa, the Chief of Staff was dismissed (He was regarded as anti-Russian).

POLAND. *Feb. 14.*—Warsaw radio announced that the Government had handed a Note to the British Ambassador asking for the liquidation of the Polish army units under British command in Italy and Great Britain. It stated that the men, who could no longer be regarded as Polish soldiers, must apply individually to Polish Consuls for permission to return.

Feb. 16.—Yugoslav memo regarding the Army of Gen. Anders. (*see the United Nations Meeting*.)

PORTUGAL. *Feb. 8.*—The police closed the premises of the United Democratic Opposition movement in Lisbon.

RUMANIA. *Feb. 5.*—The Government received Notes from the British and U.S. Governments announcing their decision to accord it recognition. The British Note emphasized that the Government understood that Rumania intended to hold elections in May at the latest. A memorandum on assurances given on Jan. 9 to Sir Archibald Clark Kerr and Mr. Harriman stated that Dr. Groza had said that all parties would enjoy freedom of the press and of speech and association so far as it was compatible with the national interest. They would also have the right to publish their own newspapers and to receive an equitable share of newsprint.

SOUTH AFRICA. *Feb. 7.*—Parliament concurred unanimously in the Governments' ratification of the U.N. Charter.

SPAIN. *Feb. 4.*—A strike in protest against the food shortage by 20,000 textile workers in Catalonia resulted in the authorities promising larger supplies of meat, fish, and bread.

Feb. 9.—Gen. Franco said at Segovia that his continuation in power was necessary for the rehabilitation of Spain, for which increasing production and large-scale house-building were essential. This could not be done with a different Government every day.

Feb. 13.—A letter signed by 560 leading Royalists (including many men prominent in public life) was sent to Don Juan in Portugal to show their support.

Feb. 16.—Republican leaflets were scattered in Madrid, and demonstrations by Fascists led to traffic jams, but no incidents were reported.

Feb. 17.—The Ministry of Education dismissed 5 university professors and men of letters who signed the message to Don Juan.

SYRIA AND THE LEBANON. *Feb. 5.*—The Governments' appeal to the Security Council regarding the presence of foreign troops. (see *The United Nations Meeting.*)

Feb. 14.—The appeal to U.N.O. before the Security Council. (see *the United Nations Meeting.*)

Feb. 16.—Security Council's decision regarding the appeal. (see *the United Nations Meeting.*)

TANGANYIKA. *Feb. 12.*—A meeting at Arusha of delegates from all parts of the country protested against the British Government's decision to place Tanganyika under U.N.O. trusteeship and passed a resolution that it should be declared a British Colony.

U.S.A. *Feb. 4.*—A strike of tugboats in New York harbour for higher wages led to the virtual cessation of traffic.

Feb. 5.—The Director-General of U.N.R.R.A. issued a statement in which he said that more men, women, and children in Europe and the Far East were hungry this winter than at any time in modern history. The needs of U.N.R.R.A. in January totalled 700,000 tons, but only 400,000 were delivered, and in February even less would be available. The situation was "highly critical".

President Truman ordered the seizure of the tugboat industry by the Office of Defence Transportation.

The C.I.O. ordered all member unions (except those of transport and certain public services) to stop work on Feb. 11 afternoon in support of current strikes and as an expression of the C.I.O.'s determination to "defeat the evil conspiracy of the monopoly corporations and their cohorts in Congress and the Courts".

Feb. 6.—President Truman banned the use of wheat in the production of alcohol and beer and ordered limitations in the use of other grains. He also published a 9-point plan to meet the food crisis, which he said, might prove to be the worst in modern times. The plan included direct control over exports of wheat and flour, priority in rail transport of wheat, meat, and other essential foods; special efforts to

export specified quantities of meat, dairy produce, fats, etc.; the release of service vessels for transport for food; and a campaign by all Government agencies to obtain consumer co-operation in conserving food.

Feb. 7.—President Truman told the press that if it was necessary to bring back food rationing to prevent people dying of starvation then Americans should be rationed. He hoped that under the plans announced the previous day (which had been adopted by the Cabinet) it would be possible to send 6 million tons of wheat to Europe by June 30.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report to the President, said that the aircraft carrier had replaced the battleship as the spearhead of the Fleet. The post-war Atlantic and Pacific Fleets would be built round 13 large carriers, augmented by 13 escort carriers and only 4 battleships. Naval power remained the key to their security and ability to reach out anywhere in the world to help halt aggression.

In the 3 years ended June 30, 1945 the Navy spent over \$90,000 million for war materials, and reached a strength of 3 million men. The Navy had 50,759 vessels, and during the 5 years had received 80,300 aircraft. Navy aeroplanes destroyed over 17,000 Japanese planes for the loss of 2,700.

Feb. 8.—The Secretary of Commerce, speaking at Newhaven, said "the whole fight for the people's peace" could fail if Congress did not approve the loan to Britain. The sum was no more than the cost of 15 days' fighting in the war.

The Secretary of State told the press that the Government had put forward (in London in September) a proposal for U.S. trusteeship of Tripolitania, Cyrenaica, Eritrea, and Somaliland, to last for 10 years, after which the colonies would become independent.

Feb. 9.—A State Department spokesman told the press that for a year there had been "no formal approach" from Moscow towards an American loan. A special committee of the House of Representatives dealing with the question found that Russia had formed a *bloc* giving her the right of control over trade with Eastern Europe and urged that a relaxation of that control should be made a condition of any loan by America or any other nation. It stated that negotiations were actually going on for a credit of \$1,000 million.

Feb. 10.—President Truman received Mr. Churchill in Washington.

Feb. 11.—The terms of the secret agreement at Yalta were published. (see *Great Britain*.)

Mr. Byrnes told the Foreign Policy Association in New York that without the loan to Britain "our efforts to construct an expanding world economy may well be frustrated. With it, we shall have won the support of a powerful ally in our efforts to break down those harmful economic practices which throttle trade, perpetuate poverty, engender ill-will among nations, and sow the seeds of conflict". He declared that the interdependence of world economy was just as real as that of national economy, and denied emphatically that the credit would contribute to inflation in America.

Feb. 12.—The Government published a blue-book accusing Argentina of war-time collaboration, espionage, and intrigue in the Western

Hemisphere and positive aid to Germany. The charges were based on documents discovered in Germany, of which an "enormous volume" had been found, and the blue-book was handed to all Latin American countries except Argentina with a request for comment. It stated that members of the military Government in power since June, 1943 conspired with Germany to undermine Governments in neighbouring countries, to destroy their collaboration with the Allies, and starting with the Castillo Government successive Governments had pursued a policy of positive aid for Germany. It named Col. Peron as "a principal leader" of the conspirators.

The Secretary of State told the press that Russia was still asking for the sole trusteeship of Tripolitania.

Feb. 13.—Mr. Ickes resigned office as Secretary of the Interior owing to a personal disagreement with President Truman.

Feb. 14.—President Truman announced a modification of the Government's wage and price policy to permit of wage increases within certain limits and to allow any industry placed in a position of hardship to seek price adjustments immediately, and not at the end of a 6 months period, as hitherto.

Gen. Bedell Smith was appointed Ambassador to the Soviet Union in succession to Mr. Harriman, who had resigned.

Feb. 15.—The U.S. Steel Workers' Union and the Steel Corporation signed an agreement ending the strike, which was estimated to have cost 6 million tons of steel and \$80 million in lost wages. Other steel companies followed suit. Wages were raised 18½ cents an hour after the Government agreed to allow the industry price increases averaging \$5 a ton.

Feb. 16.—It was stated at the White House that the President had been fully informed of the Canadian investigations into the alleged leakage of official secrets before the announcement of the arrests in Canada.

U.S.S.R. *Feb. 6.*—M. Molotov, in a pre-election broadcast, said that perhaps someone abroad was still "blissfully wishing that it would be rather nice if the leadership of our Government passed into the hands of another party than the Communist Party". To anyone cherishing that hope he could answer that it was plain wishful thinking. It went without saying that they needed a long period of peace and that they must safeguard the security of their country in order to solve that greatest of problems. That was why the Soviet people were so watchful when questions were being discussed which concerned possible breeding-grounds for disturbances of the peace and international security. Was it possible, for instance, to overlook such facts as the keeping of hundreds of thousands of German troops inside the occupation area of their ally, or the action of their allies in Italy in supporting thousands of troops of the Polish General Anders, well known for his hatred of the Soviet Union? It was quite impossible to explain away such facts as being in the interest of international peace and security.

Feb. 9.—Marshal Stalin, in an election speech, said the war was the

result of the development of economic and political stresses on the basis of monopolistic capitalism. The inequality among capitalist countries usually led, in the course of time, to a sharp disturbance of balance in the entire world system of capitalism. Countries considering themselves inferior with regard to raw materials usually attempted by force to change the situation in their favour. As a result the capitalistic world was split into two hostile camps. War might have been avoidable if there had been a possibility of dividing export markets equally among nations, but that was impossible to carry out in existing capitalist conditions.

Though both world wars resulted from crisis within the capitalist system the second was radically different from the first, because in its case the Fascist States, before attacking the Allies, destroyed in their own countries the last trace of bourgeois-democratic liberties and set up a ruthless, terrorist régime, crushed the sovereignty of small nations, and embarked on a policy of grab, and he instanced the seizure of Czechoslovakia and part of China, showing that the war early assumed the character of an anti-Fascist war of liberation.

The war was the cruellest of their history; but it was also a great education and a test for all the national forces, the result of which helped them to assess the activity of the party and its members. The war itself had, in fact, shown their organizers and leaders in their true light, and this made it much easier to weigh things up. From the domestic point of view the victory proved a triumph for their Communist order. The war disproved all the allegations that their public order was a risky experiment imposed on the people by the *Cheka*, and showed that the Red Army possessed the most modern armaments, first class command, and a high morale. "Our motherland", he said, "has been transformed from a backward country to a world Power, from an agrarian into an industrial country, and all in 13 years." During the last 3 years of the war their armament was far superior to the Germans. They were producing over 30,000 tanks and armoured cars and 40,000 aircraft annually, and up to 120,000 guns and 450,000 machine-guns. In a reference to the new five-year plan he said rationing would be abolished in the nearest future, and great attention paid to the expansion of production of consumer goods and the raising of the standard of living by means of a consistent lowering of prices. Further, if they gave proper help to their scientists they could not only catch up but overtake in the very near future the achievements of science abroad. As to long-term planning the Party would organize a powerful effort of their national economy which would enable them to treble production as compared with the pre-war period.

Feb. 10.—Polling began for the elections to the two Chambers of the Supreme Council. There was only one candidate for each seat and all belonged to the Communist and non-party people's *bloc*, which was appealing for a unanimous vote of confidence. Over 96 per cent of the electorate voted.

Publication of secret agreement *re* the Kuriles and Kamchatka. (*see Great Britain.*)

Feb. 14.—It was announced that the Government *bloc* received 99.18 per cent of the votes for membership of the Council of the Union, and 99.16 per cent of those for the Council of Nationalities. In each case just over 800,000 people voted against the *bloc* by striking out the candidates' names.

YUGOSLAVIA. *Feb. 6.*—Gen. Neditch committed suicide while in custody awaiting trial.

Feb. 11.—Raid on the headquarters of a "Royal Yugoslav Army" in Munich. (*see Germany.*)

Feb. 16.—Government's Note to Moscow asking the Soviet Union to place before the Security Council a memo regarding the Polish Army in Italy. (*see the United Nations Meeting.*)

THE UNITED NATIONS MEETING

Feb. 4.—In the Security Council M. Vishinsky said that one of the main features of Mr. Bevin's speech on Feb. 1 was "the very careless way in which he dealt with facts". He had placed all the guilt on the Greek Communists and supported this by mentioning a report by a trade union commission. He (M. Vishinsky) could not accept that report as a whole without making any criticism; for instance, the inference that resistance detachments took no part in the fight against the Germans simply because one battalion was seen moving in the opposite direction to the fleeing Germans seemed to him absolutely groundless.

After quoting from past speeches by Labour M.P.s on conditions and events in Greece, M. Vishinsky asked whether Mr. Bevin thought his declaration that Russian propaganda was a threat to the peace of the world was in harmony with the friendship between the two nations. The Soviet delegation thought that nothing worse could have been said, and Mr. Bevin's statement had no ground whatever. It was an old song—the song about Moscow propaganda, and he cited the charges made in the 1920s (Arcos, etc.) all of which had failed, he said, but the traces were still left—heavy, dangerous traces.

He then declared again that the presence of British troops *was* an interference in the internal affairs of Greece and was fraught with grave consequences for the maintenance of peace. Referring next to Mr. Bevin's figures of the strength of the armed forces in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria he said they were somewhat exaggerated. In any case, the danger did not come from the fact that the Greek forces were big or small; it was linked with a situation where adventurers who already had arms had got out of control. Democratic elements were paralysed by the presence of British troops and reactionary elements were becoming more reactionary every day.

Mr. Bevin took up M. Vishinsky's points one by one, and showed how Greece had always been mentioned whenever Rumania or Bulgaria or other countries in which Russia was predominant were referred to at conferences or in exchanges of correspondence between Russia, Britain, and the U.S.A. On each occasion, the Soviet Government had either not pursued the matter or had expressed confidence in Britain's or America's policy.

It had been inferred that he had said that E.L.A.S. did nothing in the war. Actually, he supported E.A.M. when in the Coalition Government believing that they were doing good work. But when Germany surrendered they suddenly stopped driving the Germans out and resorted to a policy of seizing power. As for the quotations from the speeches of Labour M.P.s they were speaking for themselves—because a man was a member of the Labour Party that did not debar him from putting his own point of view, and if those speeches were cited, the replies by Mr. Attlee, Mr. Eden, and others should also be read and quoted.

Did M. Vishinsky believe, he asked, that Britain had deliberately put troops into Greece to support certain elements there with the object

or the likelihood of disturbing and endangering international peace? If he did, then he (Mr. Bevin) ought not to be sitting at that table. "You are established", he said, "to maintain world peace, and I am branded at the first meeting as being the one person in the world disturbing and endangering it. I hope no member of the Council will run away from that issue. The British Government are entitled to an answer. I have met my Cabinet this morning, and they ask for an answer".

It was said that incidents might occur on the frontier. He had urged that there be a commission to investigate, and indeed, he was willing to enter into arrangements with all the Powers on the frontier to take every step to see that no single incident occurred. It was also said that they were suppressing E.A.M. and that they were the majority of the people. He defied anyone to tell him who was the majority political party till they got an election. Both sides said they would win.

As to Soviet propaganda, he was sure M. Vishinsky could not deny that the references to Greece were continuing and were very unsettling, and setting one section of the community against the other. British troops were said to be in Greece to protect the Right. That was not true; they had protected all the people whenever the Government had called upon them to do it, or whenever they had discovered danger to public order. Public disorder was, of course, not confined to Greece, but in the period Dec. 20, 1944 to Jan. 13, 1945 there were 122 incidents perpetrated by the Left, 41 by the Right, and 58 by persons unknown. He went on:

"I would never use a small Power to achieve our diplomatic aims. I take the view that those peoples gathered in that part of the world . . . ought to be living under the friendly umbrella of the victorious allies. That is the policy of the British Government". All their influence had been used in Greece, as elsewhere, to direct the attention of the inhabitants to economic rehabilitation and reconstruction. The British people would never stand for it for one minute, and no Government could hold office for a day if it was using such a position to endanger world peace. But the British Government's conscience was clear, and it could not submit to the condemnation of the Soviet Government either by inference or implication, and neither would the British people.

He ended by saying that international affairs would be sweeter if these charges were not made; they all had diplomatic representatives and opportunities to inquire one of another. Three times at official and unofficial meetings he had given the utmost detail on their attitude in Greece and it had not been questioned. And yet Britain was charged before this tribunal with a crime against humanity—the most diabolical crime that any nation could be charged with: of endangering the peace of the world. To this charge he wanted an answer.

M. Aghnides said he was overwhelmed and puzzled by M. Vishinsky's speech, and referred to an allusion to the danger of war with Bulgaria, as if Greece was in a position to declare war. In particular, she wanted to be friends with Russia, and he wondered why she was considered to be a danger to peace. Greece wanted help, and with that help she could

soon compose her differences. If the natural forces in Greece were left unhampered they would display democratically their verdict at the elections. Greece deserved the confidence of the Council, and he begged it not to lose a sense of proportion by giving incidents an exaggerated importance.

Mr. Stettinius said Greece had suffered more than any other country, and only on the clearest showing would the Council be justified in taking action against her Government which might seriously affect the situation. His own Government was satisfied that there was no reasonable ground for believing that the presence of British troops there could be regarded as a situation likely to endanger peace, and it was convinced therefore that the Council would not be justified under Chapter 6 in making findings to such an effect. He did not think it would be wise for the Council to take formal action in this case; they were not there to vote each other down, but to help compose differences that led to dangers. The Council could do most to maintain international peace and develop friendly relations among nations by refraining from intervention in this unhappy situation. He suggested that the Soviet Union and Britain be thanked for their statements and for their exposition of the case, and that no further action be taken.

M. Bidault said his delegation did not think that the presence of British troops at this time was a menace to peace and security in the sense envisaged in the Charter. Dr. Wellington Koo said the only difference of view now seemed to centre on the time of withdrawal of the troops. The Greek delegate said their presence was indispensable, so the Council could not do better than note all the declarations made and look forward to the day when the emergence of a freely elected Government would be the signal for their withdrawal.

The Chairman, speaking for Australia, pointed out that if only internal peace and security were endangered the Council would not be required to concern itself with the matter. M. Viskinsky had himself stated that internal disorder in Greece was a matter for Greece herself. It was not of a character to endanger the peace of other countries, and he therefore supported the U.S. proposal that no further action be taken.

The Polish delegate said he agreed with Mr. Bevin that the presence of British troops was not a threat to the peace of the world, but this privilege, enjoyed by the great Powers, of sending help and armed force into a foreign country did raise grave problems of the kind they had discussed. This was not a unique case, but a precedent—a precedent for other countries which might not be in quite the same position but, now or later, in a similar position. They must therefore pronounce themselves quite clearly.

M. Vishinsky would not modify the Soviet attitude, but, to ensure full co-operation, the delegation would agree, he said, to the discussion being closed by a declaration from the President, without any resolution, to the effect that, in view of the declaration of the U.K. Government that British troops would be withdrawn as soon as possible, the Council was of opinion that the question had been exhausted.

Mr. Bevin said that left him exactly where he was before, and he

could not accept a declaration about withdrawing British troops, with nothing said about their not constituting a danger to international peace. He was not so childish as to fall for that.

The President then asked the Council to vote on a resolution submitted by the Egyptian delegate stating that the Council noted with satisfaction the spirit of frankness and sincerity which animated the delegates . . . and, "while considering that the presence of British troops in Greece does not constitute a menace to international peace or security, takes note of the declaration made by the delegate of the U.K. that British troops will be withdrawn from Greece as soon as the reasons for their presence have disappeared".

M. Vishinsky maintained that the resolution dealt with a matter of substance, and was not a matter of procedure, and therefore required unanimity among the 5 permanent members; and the Soviet Union objected to it.

Mr. Bevin said he was ready to accept the original U.S. proposal "that the Council take no further action", provided there were added the words "In view of the fact that the presence of British troops does not constitute a situation which endangers international peace and security". The Council then adjourned.

The Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee received a letter from the delegate of Panama asking for help for the 30,000 political prisoners stated to be in custody in Barcelona and the thousands more in Madrid, Asturias, Valencia, and other cities. He said that thousands more were living under constant threat of death.

Feb. 5.—The Security Council failed to find a formula expressing the view that the Soviet charges against Britain regarding Greece were unjustified, owing to the objections of M. Vishinsky. A Polish suggestion was not accepted by Mr. Bevin, and the meeting adjourned.

The Secretary-General received a letter from the Governments of Syria and the Lebanon asking the Security Council to recommend "the total and simultaneous evacuation" of British and French troops from both countries. It said their presence might give rise to serious disputes; the past had "shown that some of these troops have been a constant menace to peace and security in this region".

The Anglo-French Agreement of Dec. 13, it said, contained the statement that "the programme of evacuation will be drawn up in such a way that it will ensure the maintenance in the Levant of sufficient forces to guarantee security until such time as the United Nations Organization has decided on the organization of collective security in this zone. Until these arrangements have been carried out the French Government will retain forces regrouped in the Lebanon".

The agreement accordingly made the withdrawal of the troops subject to conditions which were inconsistent with the spirit and letter of the U.N. Charter. Therefore, since the French and British Governments had referred to the U.N.O. the Levant Governments, under Article 34 of the Charter, had brought the dispute to the attention of the Security Council and requested it to adopt a decision recommending the total and simultaneous evacuation of the foreign troops.

Feb. 6.—M. Vishinsky announced in the Security Council that the Soviet delegation did not insist that the declaration or resolution regarding Greece should state that the presence of British troops was a danger to peace and security, and also did not insist that it should mention that those troops must be withdrawn from Greece. He proposed that there should be no formal resolution. After an interval for private discussion Mr. Bevin said that since the delegates of 8 countries (Australia, France, the U.S.A., China, Egypt, Poland, Brazil, and the Netherlands) declared that the presence of British troops did not constitute a situation likely to endanger peace and the original demands of the Soviet delegation were no longer insisted upon he was willing, as a similar gesture, not to insist on a formal resolution. He was most anxious to see the elimination of all quarrels between the great Soviet Republic and Great Britain, and the maintenance and strengthening of unity of action between them and between the members of the Security Council as a whole. He added with emphasis "This controversy between our two great nations has now been closed".

The President then read out a statement he had himself submitted, which was approved. It read: "I feel we should take note of the declaration made before the Security Council by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the U.K., and Greece. And also the views expressed by the representatives of the following members of the Council: The United States, France, China, Australia, Poland, the Netherlands, Egypt, and Brazil, in regard to the question of the presence of troops in Greece as recorded in the proceedings of the Council. And consider the matter as closed".

The Assembly and Security Council sitting separately in plenary session elected 14 Judges for the International Court of Justice. They came from Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Egypt, France, Mexico, Norway, Salvador, the U.K., the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

The General Committee agreed that the next session of the Assembly should be convened on Sept. 10.

Feb. 7.—The Security Council dealt with the case of Indonesia, and M. Manuilsky complained that fighting was still going on and that Japanese troops were being used against "the national and democratic movement of the people". He quoted from British papers and speeches to show the kind of operations which had been going on, and cited a New York wireless report that the losses of the Indonesians totalled between 30 and 40 thousand. Such intervention by British troops was in direct contradiction with Article 1 of the Charter, and with Article 73. The Ukrainian delegation recognized that the presence of allied troops might be dictated by strategic considerations, and British troops remained there with the consent of the United Nations for the purpose of disarming the Japanese, but it did not follow from this that their operations against the national democratic movement and the use of Japanese troops to this end were carried out with the consent of the United Nations.

He did not ask for the withdrawal of the British troops, he said, but

asked the Council to carry out the necessary investigation and to take the measures provided for under the Charter to put an end to "this abnormal situation". The most appropriate solution would be for it to set up a special commission to do this.

Mr. Bevin remarked that Britain had a free press, but it was not always right in what it printed, and then said he took it that the British troops were not regarded as a danger to peace, as their withdrawal was not asked for. As to sending a commission, who was the sovereign authority over Indonesia? It was the decision of the Allies to restore territory taken by the enemy to its sovereign authority. As to Indonesia, the Dutch were the first people to declare war on the Japanese. They were overcome when neither Britain nor America were able to send sufficient support. While the Japanese were in occupation they developed Fascist forces, armed and trained them, and indoctrinated them with Fascist ideas. They armed many thousands with rifles, tanks, and other weapons.

He then recounted shortly what had happened, emphasizing the following points: When the British troops arrived they never fired a shot. They were fired at and killed, and he asked what would M. Manuilsky have done if he went there to rescue, first of all, 250,000 internees, some white and some native, and who had been taken inland by the Japanese. "I give you the lie that we ever attacked the Indonesian movement", he declared.

When the British general found out that his troops were being attacked he had a conference with an Indonesian leader. Gen. Mallaby arrived, and got the Nationalist leaders together and arranged a truce so that he could carry out his task, and while he was signing it he was assassinated and other officers were killed. They had no protection; they did not have an army, for they trusted the men they were talking to. At that time there were only 3,000 British troops there, and they had a task to do. Later, Adm. Mountbatten held the Japanese responsible for maintaining order. It was rather a hostage idea; they were told to see that law and order were maintained, otherwise there might be wholesale murder right through Indonesia. Youths trained in Nazi ideas were fully armed.

It was true they had used bombs against certain fortified nests. British troops who went in to bring the internees down to the coast were ambushed and some were killed; but not one word was said about the Indonesian attack upon the British.

He had gone through the whole business line by line in Moscow with M. Molotov and not a word was said to him as to Britain's action at all. Yet after he had explained the whole of their position with great friendliness, "we are now faced", he said, "with a charge based on newspaper cuttings and the rest".

After referring to Sir Archibald Clark Kerr's mission he said that if the United Nations wanted to help it should be done not by sending another commission, but by urging those engaged in negotiations to bend their energies to effect a settlement and try and eliminate the difficulty altogether. However, if he was not being asked to do anything,

he would leave it to the Council because, under the arrangements with the Allies, the Dutch were regarded as the sovereign Power.

Dr. van Kleffens pointed out that Holland had placed the whole of her merchant navy of 3 million tons at the disposal of the Allies, but when she wanted to send men to the East Indies she had not the shipping available. When Holland was freed her troops were not in a fit state for foreign service, and when seasoned British and American troops were offered Holland gave the obvious reply. Their allies, guided by Gen. MacArthur's sound judgment, understood that it was for them to step in, and Holland fully consented to the sending of British forces. Their task was to rescue 200,000 Europeans who had refused to be evacuated, just as much as to disarm the Japanese. He went on: "We and the British accepted, but with regret, fortuitous circumstances in which Japanese troops had to be used for one brief stage and to a limited extent. I want to bear testimony to the extreme restraint in the behaviour of British troops in Java and other areas in the Indies. It is true they have used their arms, but where and in what circumstances? As a general rule, in strict compliance with their express instructions and when they were attacked. They also used their arms when they were forcefully hindered in carrying out their humanitarian task of freeing prisoners of war and civilian internees. We thought sometimes that they erred on the side of excess in their extreme forbearance, and I think the fact that there are still tens of thousands of unfortunate people in the most terrible circumstances in the interior and even not so far from the coast shows that the energy displayed by British troops in carrying out their task was tempered by very great forbearance and restraint. When soldiers are attacked I should like to see the soldiers who did not take counter measures".

The need for which the British troops were sent had not ceased to exist. There were still many people in great danger from terrorists who did not know how to behave themselves. He did not identify the Nationalist movement with the horrible things that has happened, but if they occurred it justified the presence of allied troops. As their withdrawal was not asked for what were they supposed to do? Did M. Manuilsky want them to stay there for a holiday? Did he think it in the nature of British troops to remain inactive when children's hands were cut off?

There was no situation endangering international peace, and no international friction which might lead to an infringement of the peace. Nor was there any infringement of the Charter so far as it had to do with Dutch and British troops. There was therefore no case for the Security Council to deal with.

The Secretary-General received from the Director-General of U.N.R.R.A. an urgent message about the food situation.

Feb. 8.—In the Political and Security Committee a Russian resolution calling on member States to take all necessary measures for the arrest of war criminals and on non-member States to apprehend and hand over any on their territories was referred to a drafting committee for clarification of its terms.

The Economic and Social Council agreed to a Chinese proposal for calling an international health conference.

Feb. 9.—In the Security Council M. Manuilsky reiterated that the chief task entrusted to the British forces in Java was to receive the surrender of the Japanese, and declared that they had not done this. He asked, did the special treaty between Britain and Holland imply that Britain should use arms to prevent the population from putting forward and defending their elementary rights? If so, it was in violation of Article 103 of the Charter. As to the question as to what the Ukrainian Government would have done if its troops were faced with the need to defend themselves, he replied that "the soldiers of my country do not fight to defend the interests of Shell Oil; they fight to defend their country".

He formulated his proposals as: (1) the use of British troops against the Indonesians was not just or right, (2) it was inadmissible that Japanese troops should be used against the population, who were defending their elementary national rights; (3) the Indonesians should be granted the principles and rights established in the Charter; (4) a commission should be sent to deal with an abnormal situation.

Mr. Bevin insisted that a great point of principle was involved: the sovereignty of the Netherlands, and he quoted Article 2 of the Charter to show that U.N.O. was not authorized to intervene in affairs which were within the jurisdiction of a State.

What was done in Indonesia was a matter for the Dutch Government of their own volition. It was with the Japanese-trained extremists that the British troops had had trouble: the real nationalist movement was as desirous of settling this business as they were, but "these forces have been unleashed behind them, which makes it very difficult for them. It is our duty to encourage them to negotiate, to strengthen them, and to do what we can to get this situation cleared up".

Dr. van Kleffens emphasized that internal matters of any given State were not for the United Nations to deal with. As for its being a one-sided war, there were actually tens of thousands of very well equipped Indonesians, who operated in military formations. He then asked, could it be supposed that a British Labour Government could send troops to Java to defend the interests of the Shell Oil Co.? "Looking at the Charter", he ended, "I must say that there is no case, and no case has been established".

The Assembly elected a Polish Judge as the 15th member of the International Court of Justice. It adopted a resolution moved by the delegate of Panama recalling the provision made at San Francisco that the Charter could not apply to "States whose régimes have been installed with the help of the armed forces of countries which have fought against the United Nations so long as these régimes are in power".

The Assembly adopted a recommendation of the General Committee that the second part of its session should open on Sept. 3.

Feb. 10.—In the Security Council M. Vishinsky supported the proposal for sending a commission to Java, and complained that if

Britain was allowed to send Sir Archibald Clark Kerr other States should be able to do the same. He objected to this "privileged position" of some States and said "if this procedure is adopted it will mean, I think, the end of international organization and the end of the United Nations . . . we oppose every kind of inequality. . . ." He also complained that the British and Dutch delegations had created a situation of inequality in the Council, saying "we cannot fight on the same terms as they in this matter" as those delegations had their own sources of information and their troops on the spot; yet they opposed the sending of a commission to establish the facts, as though they feared the shedding of light on the situation.

He denied that the matter was discussed "line by line" in Moscow with M. Molotov, and declared that the 80,000 armed men in Java represented a popular army. The situation might light a spark which would set light to the powder barrel. The Council had the right to intervene even in what the Charter described as "essentially" a matter "within the domestic jurisdiction of any State". He declared that the United Nations could not be an effective organ unless the nations sacrificed a part of their sovereignty.

The Egyptian delegate said the British troops had not yet carried out the purpose for which they were sent, and until they had the Council had no business to intervene.

Mr. Bevin said he could not be a party to a commission because of the reflection on the British Government in the letter of the Ukrainian delegation. In it M. Manuilsky did not claim that Britain had endangered peace, and only did so by inference. Therefore he (Mr. Bevin) made his protest in the only way he could—by resisting a commission—against a great State putting charges on the agenda, being unable to substantiate them, and then asking for a commission. He could not allow all kinds of implications about the British soldier to be made unchallenged. Reference had been made to Poland and Rumania, but the arrangements made were to resolve a conflict between allies. In neither case did Britain charge the Soviet Government or the presence of their troops with endangering peace.

As for the difficulties in Java there was a use of Japanese troops on one occasion only, when a lot of women and children and British troops were in danger, and a full statement was made in Parliament. The Dutch Government were doing their best to carry out Article 1 (2) in the spirit of the Charter. The British Government would not interfere in any decisions taken; all he was concerned about was this reflection on British troops and the charge that they were endangering peace.

Dr. van Kleffens asked whether, if there existed that war M. Vishinsky spoke about, the responsible *bona fide* leaders of the nationalists would be negotiating with the Dutch? The military action was not directed against the nationalist movement as such, and the negotiations proved this. He must refuse to accept a commission, except one restricted to the conduct of the British troops and agreed to by both parties. Dutch troops were going to Java primarily to relieve the British, and he could promise that they would no more be used

against the *bona fide* nationalists than the troops now there had been, but they would be used against unruly elements. Mr. Sjahrir had told the press only the previous day that the nationalists had little control over gangs of extremists who were engaged in attacks on British patrols.

Feb. 11.—It was announced that U.N.O. had decided to take over the buildings and library of the League at Geneva for 48 million Swiss francs.

The Political and Security Committee unanimously approved a resolution recommending the taking at once of all measures for the arrest of war criminals.

The Security Council decided, after discussion, that the Ukrainian delegate, as a non-member of the Council, was entitled to submit a proposal (that a commission of inquiry should be sent to Java). M. Manuilsky had just argued that the military intervention was a proper matter for study by the Council, and did not fall within the competence of the Dutch Government. In no international agreement would they find any provision which would allow the use of enemy troops against the people of an occupied country, and the precedent was a dangerous one. They were making a mercenary army out of enemy troops and using it against a people which had resisted aggression. He recalled the League's experience in the case of Spain, when it decided that it was not within its competence to intervene in the civil war and that this did not threaten international peace. And only 2 years later came the most terrible of wars. He therefore appealed to the Council with the utmost force to accept his proposal that the Council should "set up a commission consisting of representatives of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., China, Great Britain, and the Netherlands which should carry out an inquiry on the spot, establish peace in Indonesia, and report to the Council on the results of their work".

The President at once asked the Council to decide whether the Ukrainian delegate had "the right of proposition", and pointed out that Article 31 only gave a complainant the right to take part in the discussion. Mr. Stettinius was against a non-member submitting a formal resolution, but other members thought M. Manuilsky should not be debarred from making a proposal, and it was decided to consider his submission without prejudice to the future.

Mr. Makin, speaking for Australia, said that if a commission was appointed his country would ask to be associated with its work. But if he were asked whether the action of British troops in Indonesia threatened the maintenance of international peace and security he would reply "No".

Mr. Stettinius said the power of investigation was one of the means whereby the Council could determine whether it should deal with a particular situation, but precisely because that right was so important the U.S. Government felt that investigation should not be lightly undertaken. No speaker had questioned that the presence of the British troops was justified or had asked for their withdrawal.

He did not believe any investigation was called for on the score of the

way in which the British were trying to carry out their task. As to the working out of the future relationship of the Dutch Government and the Indonesians the situation had been greatly complicated by the influence and past activities of the Japanese and their continued presence. It was therefore of the highest importance that the surrender terms should be carried out with the utmost speed. Frankly he did not believe that it had been made out to the Council that a constructive purpose was to be served by an investigation. The best hope for a settlement lay in the prompt completion of the negotiations.

Dr. Wellington Koo suggested adjourning the discussion in the hope that the negotiations would soon end in a settlement.

He saw no objection to the proposal for a commission in principle, as it was well within the right of the Council under Article 34, but his delegation did not insist on an inquiry. They thought, however, that the dispatch of a commission with a clearly defined scope might serve the double purpose of dissipating any doubt about the situation and promoting co-operation among the United Nations.

Feb. 12.—In the Security Council the President asked the members to vote on the Ukrainian resolution, whereupon the Egyptian delegate intervened to propose an "amendment of substance". M. Vishinsky strongly urged an adjournment, and the President decided that the amendment required further time for study. The meeting adjourned without a vote being taken.

Before this the Mexican delegate had spoken in favour of a commission of enquiry. M. Bidault said direct negotiations constituted the proper method of dealing with the matter, but it seemed to his delegation that the sending of a commission was unlikely to promote appeasement or hasten the negotiations. As the Ukrainian resolution would not receive the necessary majority would it not be better to seek a solution in a declaration by the President taking note of the statements made?

The delegate of Brazil opposed the sending of a commission, but the Polish delegate supported it, and also suggested that the leaders of the nationalist movement should have the right freely to express their opinion to the Council. Dr. van Kleffens said that the sending of a commission might well have a confusing effect on the negotiations, and made the attitude of his Government clear in a five-point statement.

M. Manuilsky said he had instructions to insist on a definite decision one way or another. If the use of Japanese troops against the people was a purely internal question the Council must say so; then, if that decision was taken, "we shall go home, and we shall say that the use of enemy Japanese Fascist troops against this innocent population is a matter solely within the competence of the Netherlands Government."

He suggested that the murder of Brigadier Mallaby was the act of Japanese agents.

The General Assembly dealt with the report on refugees submitted by the Norwegian delegation for the third committee, and rejected 3 amendments proposed by M. Vishinsky.

Mrs. Roosevelt read a declaration on the participation of women in

the work of the United Nations, expressing gratification that 17 women delegates were taking part.

The Political and Security Committee reached agreement, by majority, on the application of the World Federation of Trade Unions to take part in U.N.O. by being associated with the work of the Economic and Social Council. It agreed to a resolution recommending that Council to make arrangements enabling the W.F.T.U., the International Co-operative Alliance, the A.F.L. and other national organizations to co-operate in a consultative capacity.

Feb. 13.—In the Security Council the President said he had decided that the Egyptian amendment to the original Ukrainian resolution was not an amendment but an independent substantive proposal, and the Ukrainian resolution ought therefore to be voted on first. The Council agreed, and the Ukrainian resolution was voted on and received only 2 votes: Russia and Poland.

Dr. van Kleffens then said that the reply to the Egyptian resolution was that there was no case. In any event, the British troops had not deserved blame, there was no threat to international peace; and the Council was being asked to deal with a matter clearly within the jurisdiction of the Dutch Government. He would be glad, however, to suggest to his Government that, as an act of courtesy, the Council be informed of the discussions going on in Java.

M. Vishinsky said he wished to propose an amendment to the Egyptian proposal, to the effect that, with a view to clarifying the situation and re-establishing normal conditions a commission should be sent out. Mr. Bevin at once said that this seemed to him to be exactly the same as the resolution just defeated. As to the Egyptian proposals, para. 1 declared that it was clearly understood that British troops were not to be used against the nationalist movement. "That", he said, "is an inference that they have been used and will be used in this way. My Government have instructed me to vote against it. It is the most unfriendly thing that could be put up to condemn Britain in a difficult and delicate operation". The troops were under the combined Chiefs of Staff, and it was for that body to tell them whether they were doing wrong. Up to now nothing had been said to them. He went on:

"I think the whole honour of the British Government and its conduct in this business are involved. We cannot accept anything from this Security Council which implies either that we attack the Indonesian national movement or that we are likely to, and if other Governments on this Council ask to be trusted I ask for the British Government to be trusted in carrying out the obligations which the Allied commanders have imposed upon us". The Egyptian delegate explained that no reflection was intended, but Mr. Bevin replied that that was how the world would read the proposal.

M. Vishinsky's amendment was then voted on, and received 3 votes: Russia, Poland, and Mexico. The Egyptian proposal was then put to the vote and was supported only by Egypt and Poland, M. Vishinsky abstained.

The Council then after discussion, agreed to postpone the Albanian application for membership.

In the General Assembly Mr. Bevin submitted a resolution asking the Assembly to issue a solemn call for a war on waste and for the utmost increase in food production. It was sponsored by Britain, France, China, the U.S.A., and the U.S.S.R. It was reinforced by a letter from the Director of U.N.R.R.A. setting out the gravity of the prospects for the future. Fats were short, as well as wheat and rice.

Mr. Bevin said it was estimated that in the first 6 months of 1946 importing countries would need over 17 million tons of wheat and flour, and that about 12 million tons would be available. Since those figures were compiled they had heard that the monsoon had failed in India, and that in South Africa the crop had failed.

In rice the deficit would be 2 million tons, and the position was worse than was estimated originally, and "we are dealing with 1,000 million of the world's population who in the next few months may be faced with famine". A recent report about Europe stated that there were 140 million people consuming an average of 1,500 calories a day, and many millions were below it. As to what they could do; first, every ounce of food must be properly used and not wasted, and secondly, Governments must collaborate to secure a fair distribution of surpluses. The period in front of them must be dealt with as a crisis period—in other words, it was another war. He regarded the resolution as a call to the nations in the greatest common cause that had ever faced them, to fight the war which Nature had imposed.

Mr. Stettinius said President Truman had already ordered important steps to enable the U.S.A. to send more grain, etc., to countries needing them, and to export 400,000 tons of fats and oils also, and large extra quantities of meat and dairy produce. They were devoting to this all refrigerated ships not essential to the armed forces. The French and Chinese Foreign Ministers emphasized that nothing short of concerted action by the United Nations could overcome the difficulties.

The Secretary-General received a letter from the Director-General of the Food and Agricultural Organization stating that that body was willing to accept responsibility for mobilizing the world's resources, and proposed the calling of an international conference, which should be attended by responsible Ministers.

Feb. 14.—The Security Council, dealing with the appeal of the Levant States, agreed that the delegates of the two Governments should be invited to join in the discussion, without a vote but with the right to make proposals.

In the Assembly the resolution on the food situation was carried unanimously, after speeches by the delegates of Australia, Canada, India, Norway, Denmark, Russia, and Cuba. The Canadian delegate said they had anticipated the spirit of the resolution by several months, and since the spring of 1944 they had exported an average of a million bushels of wheat (including flour) per working day. In the 3 crop years ending July 31, 1946 they would have exported over 1000 million bushels, including all their war-time reserve of 600 million.

They would continue to export an average of a million bushels a day.

The Assembly adopted by 32 votes to 6, with 11 abstentions and 2 absent, the resolution of the Political Committee recommending the participation of the W.F.T.U., the A.F.L. and the I.C.A. to collaborate for consultative purposes in the work of the Economic and Social Council.

The report was adopted of the headquarters committee establishing the permanent home in Westchester and Fairfield, U.S.A.

Mr. Attlee, closing the Assembly's session, said the United Nations had now been placed on a firm basis; world affairs had been discussed freely and in public, and the force of public opinion had been brought to bear on the delegates. A feeling of comradeship in a great adventure had been created among them. He paid a warm tribute to M. Spaak, who recounted the work done and ended with the words "we can send a message to the world of confidence and optimism". Hr. Lie also spoke.

Feb. 15.—The Security Council dealt with the Levant States' appeal, and the Lebanese delegate quoted a passage in the Anglo-French agreement of Dec. 13 stating that the evacuation of their troops would be arranged in such a way as to "ensure the maintenance in the Levant of sufficient forces to guarantee security until such time as the U.N.O. has decided on the organization of collective security in this zone. Until these arrangements have been carried out the French Government will retain forces regrouped in the Lebanon". He said this made the withdrawal conditional on a principle which was not in accordance with the Charter and violated the sovereignty of both the Levant States. This constituted a dispute and threatened the maintenance of international peace.

M. Bidault pointed out that the state of war had not yet ended, peace was not finally established, and troops of many nationalities and of all kinds were stationed on the territory of every belligerent country. Britain and France were ready to proceed at once to the withdrawal of their forces by submitting the matter to the Council with a view to fixing the international arrangements necessary for the maintenance of security in that area. Why did the complaint invoke Article 34 of the Charter if not because in fact there was no dispute, and because the existing situation could not really be regarded as likely to menace the maintenance of peace? For 5 years the presence of the troops had preserved the Middle East from the trials and horrors of war, and who could say they had suddenly become a threat? The agreement of Dec. 13 was not interpreted by the signatories as implying any intention to maintain indefinitely troops in the Levant without a decision in that sense being taken by the Security Council.

Sir Alexander Cadogan pointed out that the troops were not in the Levant States by virtue of any treaty provision, but as a heritage of the needs of war. The terms of the agreement were not 100 per cent satisfactory, but they represented an attempt to break the deadlock. As for the provisions about the organization of collective security,

when they made the agreement they believed that the U.N.O., not then yet in existence, would be able to take decisions which would define clearly the future responsibility for maintaining peace and security in this strategically important part of the world and thereby relieve them of their responsibility. The British delegation associated itself wholeheartedly with the French declaration that the agreement implied no intention to maintain effectives in the Levant indefinitely in the absence of a decision by the Security Council.

The Lebanese delegation said his country was ready to accept a formula under the Charter providing for the simultaneous withdrawal of British and French troops, to be achieved in such time as was needed to carry out the necessary arrangements, and to be supervised by the Council. The Syrian delegate concurred.

Mr. Stettinius said the possibilities of negotiations had not yet been exhausted; if they were undertaken, it should be clearly understood that the matter remained of concern to the Council, which should be informed of their progress.

M. Vishinsky referred to Gen. Beynet's Note to the Levant Governments of May 18, 1945 and said it was quite comprehensible that those Governments should decline to negotiate under the conditions therein set out. The state of affairs described in the Note was a violation of their sovereignty.

There was no question of the troops being needed to maintain security, and they were all agreed that foreign troops should only be sent to sovereign States at the invitation of their Governments. There existed a dispute, and they must apply a solution under the Charter. The Council must pronounce that there was no ground for the presence of these troops and that they must be withdrawn within a time fixed by the Council.

The Chinese delegate advocated the resumption of negotiations between the parties as the first step, with the Council kept informed of their progress, and Mr. Makin concurred, on behalf of Australia. Dr. van Kleffens suggested they should take note of the statement of all four parties; express confidence that as a result of negotiations the troops would leave at no distant date, and ask that the Council be kept informed.

Feb. 16.—In the Security Council two resolutions moved by Mexico and Egypt which proposed to condemn the presence of foreign troops in the Levant States as unjustified, since they "violated the principle of sovereign equality" were defeated by 5 votes to 4 (Russia, Poland, and the movers) with Britain and France abstaining.

A U.S. resolution was then carried by 7 votes to 1 (Russia), Poland abstaining. It proposed that the Council took note of "the statements made by the four parties and other members, and expressed its confidence that the foreign troops would be withdrawn as soon as practicable, and that negotiations to that end should be undertaken by the parties without delay. It requested the parties to keep the Council informed as to progress.

M. Viskinsky then stated that the vote had been taken in a matter in

which the concurrent votes of all 5 permanent members of the Council were necessary, and that as he had voted against, the resolution was lost. "I am applying the rule," he said, "and I am using my rights as a permanent member in making such statements as I think proper".

Mr. Bevin and M. Bidault admitted that he was right from the legal point of view, and the resolution was not legally binding, but their two countries would nevertheless "operate the majority decision as expressed in the vote."

The chairman declared that as no resolution had been carried the Council would pass to its next business.

M. Vishinsky, on behalf of the Yugoslav Government, presented to the Security Council a memorandum about the Polish Army in Italy, and, in a covering letter, said the Yugoslav Government regarded the situation as "a possible future threat to peace, calm, and order on the Yugoslav-Italian frontier."

The Yugoslav memo stated that the army of Gen. Anders in Italy, some 120,000 strong, had for several months been moving towards the north and north-east to approach closer to the frontier of Yugoslavia. During November 8,000 of these troops had arrived in Udine, less than 12 miles from the National Yugoslav territory of the Julian borderland. During December the first detachment of about 700 men without Polish badges appeared in Trieste, and during January this movement increased in scope, so that Gen. Anders' army now covered the whole of the line Bologna, Ferrara, Padua, Venice, Treviso, Udine. It had replaced all the British units along the northern coast of the Adriatic. The movement towards the frontier continued, and further contingents were heading towards Venice and Udine. It went on:

"The state of mind of units of the emigrant Polish army is hostile to the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. The tone of the newspaper reviews and extremely numerous propaganda publications issued by these units is aggressive and ostensibly threatening. . . . Quite recently the emigrant army in Italy initiated efforts to increase its contingents by embodying Yugoslavs who, having formed part of the quisling troops, had fled to Italian territory. . . . Rumours are spreading among these troops that Gen. Anders' army will shortly be employed to relieve the 89th U.S. division in Zone A of the Julian borderland and that it will proceed to occupy Zone B of that area, at present occupied by the forces of the Republic of Yugoslavia."

The Soviet covering letter did not ask for a debate, but only drew the attention of the Council to the facts set forth in the memo.

The Council adjourned until March 21.

The Royal Institute of International Affairs is an unofficial and non-political body, founded in 1920 to encourage and facilitate the scientific study of international questions. The Institute, as such, is precluded by the terms of its Charter from expressing an opinion on any aspect of international affairs. Any views expressed in this publication are, therefore, not those of the Institute.